

b.) Remarks

Claims 1-9, 11-27 and 29-44 are pending in this application. Claims 1-4, 11, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20-23, 25-27, and 29-41 have been amended in various particulars as indicated hereinabove. New Claims 42, 43, and 44 have been added to alternatively define Applicants' invention.

Applicants, without conceding to the correctness of the Examiner's objections and in the interest of expediting prosecution of the instant application, submit an amended claim set in order to more clearly define the claimed subject matter. Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, in paragraphs, 0029, 0038, 0040, 0041, 0047, 0057 and 0062 of the specification as filed. Support for new claim 40 can be found, for example, in paragraphs 0033 and 0062 of the specification as filed. Support for new claim 41 can be found, for example, in paragraphs 0029, 0038, 0040, 0041, 0047, 0057 and 0062 of the specification as filed. Support for new claim 42 can be found, for example, in paragraph 0028 of the specification as filed. Applicants have taken care not to incorporate any new matter into this application by way of this amendment.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-13, 15-27 and 29-41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stern et al (US 2002/0052928) ("Stern") in view of Kraft et al (US 2002/0147637) ("Kraft"). Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration of this rejection for the reasons set out below based on the above amended claims.

Claims 1, 26, and 39-41

The Examiner has rejected to claims 1, 26, and 39-41 on the basis that Stern, in light of Kraft, would suggest that "it is convenient to make the system dynamic by forming the URL by executing the codes." Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection and submits that, in fact, Stern specifically teaches away from the

instantly claimed invention in favor of what Stern believes are simpler and less complex solutions.

Stern provides a URL resolution system comprising a website crawler that has a limited ability to search script code. At paragraph 0115, with reference to script code, Stern states:

“A special case of collecting links from a Web page is when the page contains script code. In those cases, it is not straightforward to extract the links from the script. One approach would be to create and include in the Crawler parsers for every possible script language. **However, this would require a substantial development and maintenance effort, since there are many Web scripting languages, some of them quite complex. A simpler approach though that this invention implements is to extract from the script anything that looks like a URL, without the need to understand or parse “correctly” the script.**” (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Stern teaches away from a URL resolution system that can execute script code contained on a webpage. In the preceding section, Stern addresses the complex development and maintenance requirements of a webcrawler with the ability to parse script code. In rejecting this approach, Stern teaches a simpler approach in which the webcrawler extracts from script code “anything that looks like a URL.” The process by which Stern identifies script code URLs is analogous to a text-based keyword search and avoids the necessity of understanding the script code. The approach taught by Stern will inevitably result in two of the disadvantages of the prior art identified in paragraph 0006 of the present application, namely missed URLs in script code and incurred URLs being extracted. In addition, given Stern’s commentary above there would be no motivation to combine Stern with any other reference to even try to obtain the instantly claimed invention.

The Examiner, moreover, has conceded that Stern does not expressly indicate execution of script code to obtain the script URL, but alleges that Kraft discloses the execution of script code to obtain the script URL and that the invention disclosed in the

present application would have been obvious to a worker with ordinary skill in the art based on Stern in light of Kraft. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.

Kraft provides a method of altering banner advertisements based on data obtained from the analysis and evaluation of competitive advertisements contained on web pages. With respect to script code, Kraft states at paragraphs 0069 and 0070:

The page analyzer **begins** the process of adapting the banner ad at step 310 by **executing all the necessary client scripts**. The page analyzer essentially simulates web browser functionality. However, rather than rendering a document for viewing by a user, **the page analyzer constructs a document to analyze**. In simpler cases, multimedia banner ads could simply be images. Since HTML provides an tag to mark images, pattern matching is then used by the page analyzer to extract the desired source URL of the image. In more complex cases, multimedia content is the result of client script execution.

Therefore, the page analyzer **has to execute client scripts first in order to retrieve the proper URLs of a multimedia resource**; The page analyzer executes the JavaScript® algorithm to retrieve the proper multimedia source URLs, as shown in the following illustration..." (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that Kraft only discloses the analysis of script code *after* execution of all of the scripts code contained on a website. This is further highlighted in figure 3 of Kraft, which contains a flow chart in which the step of "Perform Client Scripts" appears before "Analyze Embedded Web Page."

By contrast, an aspect of the present invention involves an analysis of the script code prior to execution, followed by the execution of only certain specific portions of the code that relate to dynamic URL creation. In this regard, the Examiner's attention is directed to paragraphs 0040, 0041, 0047, 0057 and 0062 of the present application. Applicants respectfully submit that a system incorporating a script code analysis prior to execution of script code is not taught or suggested by either Stern or Kraft separately or in combination.

Applicants therefore submit that a worker skilled in the art would not have been led to combine Stern and Kraft, especially given the suggestion that inventive ingenuity would be required to develop a system that can actually, among other things, analyze and then execute script code.

Applicants respectfully submit that the invention as claimed in amended claims 1, 26 and 39-41 are patentably distinguishable from both Stern and Kraft and requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) against these claims.

Claims 2-3, 5-9, 11-13, 15-27

Claims 2-3, 5-9, 11-13, 15-27 and 29-38 depend on claim 1 or claim 26, respectively. Applicants refer the Examiner to its comments above with regard to Stern and Kraft and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under U.S.C. 103(a) against these claims.

Claims 4 and 14

The Examiner has also rejected claims 4 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stern in view of Kraft in further view of Meyerzon et al (US 2002/014637) (“Meyerzon”). With reference to claims 4 and 14, the Examiner has conceded that Stern does not expressly disclose a URL Resolution system with a notification generating function. The Examiner alleges that Meyerzon discloses a notification function and that it would have been obvious to a worker skilled in the art to combine Stern and Meyerzon to include a notification generating function.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s rejection. The combination of subject matter of Stern and Meyerzon and Kraft does not rectify the deficiencies of Stern and Kraft as outlined in the preceding paragraphs. Applicants respectfully submit that any advantages conferred by Meyerzon are completely ancillary to URL resolution and thus irrelevant given the points of distinction between the instant invention, Stern and Kraft.

Applicants believe that it has demonstrated that the subject matter claimed in the present application is patentably distinct from Stern in light of Kraft and Stern in view of Kraft and in further view of Meyerzon. Withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested

Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. Should any questions arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

By /grant houston/
J. Grant Houston
Registration No.: 35,900
Tel.: 781 863 9991
Fax: 781 863 9931

Lexington, Massachusetts 02421
Date: July 10, 2006